CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 0 8 2008

Application Number 10/561,622-Conf. #9658

Patent Number

Inventor: Masaki Hashimoto et al.

MESSAGE TO: US Patent and Trademark Office

FAX NUMBER: (571) 273-8300

FROM:

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

C. Andrew Im.

PHONE:

(212) 318-3359

Attorney Dkt. #:

NY-KIT 404-US (10513311)

PAGES (Including Cover Sheet):

CONTENTS:

Response to Restriction Requirement (with Traverse) Certificate of Transmission (1 page)

If your receipt of this transmission is in error, please notify this firm immediately by collect call to sender at (212) 318-3359 and send the original transmission to us by return mail at the address below.

This transmission is intended for the sole use of the individual and entity to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. You are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or duplication of this transmission by someone other than the intended addressee or its designated agent is strictly prohibited.

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

666 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10103 Telephone: (212) 318-3000 Facsimile: (212) 318-3400

P. 05

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Fax: 2123183400

OCT 0 8 2008

PTO/SB/97 (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U. S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Inder the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number

Application No. (If known): 10/561,622

Attomey Docket No.: NY-KIT 404-US

Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Fani Malikouzakis Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate (212) 318-3220 Telephone Number Registration Number, if applicable

Each paper must have its own certificate of transmission, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

Response to Restriction Requirement (with Traverse)

Fax: 2123183400

r.2CEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 0 8 2008

Docket No.: NY-KIT 404-US

(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of: Masaki Hashimoto et al.

Application No.: 10/561,622

Filed: November 20, 2005

For: PLANT CULTIVATING BASE BODY AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURING

THE SAME

Confirmation No.: 9658

Art Unit: 3643

Examiner: S. T. Nguyen

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

MS Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement set forth in the Office Action mailed September 9, 2008, applicant hereby provisionally elects Group 1, claims 11-20 for continued examination, with traverse. Please note that original claims 1-10 were canceled and new claims 11-27 were added by a Preliminary Amendment filed on December 20, 2005.

The Examiner has required restriction between claims 1-20 which are drawn to a plant cultivating substrate and claims 21-27 which are drawn to a method of Applicants respectfully traverse the manufacturing a plant cultivating substrate.

60124230.1

Application No.: 10/561,622

Docket No.: NY-KIT 404-US

Examiner's Restriction Requirement on the grounds that all of the claims 11-27 are related and essentially describe plant producing a plant cultivating substrate. It is urged that Groups I and Group II are at best, different embodiments of a single inventive concept for which a single patent should issue. These Groups do not constitute distinct inventions such as to require that their subject matter be prosecuted in separate application. Further, there is no extra burden on the Patent and Trademark Office to examine the allegedly separate invention in a single patent application.

Although the Commissioner may require restriction if two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in a single application (37 CFR § 1.142(a)). In the present case, although the claimed subject matter may be classified in different classes, the inventions are not independent. In fact, Group II comprises method claims for producing a plant cultivating substrate, which are essentially equivalent to the plant cultivating substrate claims which are produced by reacting various materials. It is believed that a different classification of the method and apparatus claims does not preclude inclusion of both form of claims in the same application. As stated in the decision of the Board of Appeals in Ex parte McGowan, (64 U.S.P.Q. 429), "...different classification of apparatus ... and a method ... do not appear to be pertinent to the question of division between such similar inventions as are covered by appellant's claims."

If the Examiner is aware of another method to make the product as claimed, using a process which is materially different from that set forth in the restricted claims, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to substantiate his position in greater detail. Otherwise, it is respectfully requested that the restriction requirement be withdrawn, and that each of claims 11-27 presently pending in this application be examined.

In view of the above comments, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the restriction requirement and allow applicants to prosecute the entire

2

Application No.: 10/561,622

Docket No.: NY-KIT 404-US

application in the present case. In the event the restriction requirement is made final, applicant reserves the right to file one or more divisional applications directed to the non-elected subject matter.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0624, under Order No. NY-KIT 404-US (10513311) from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: October 8, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Im

Registration No.: 40,657

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

666 Fifth Avenue

New York, New York 10103

(212) 318-3000

(212) 318-3400 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant